

But the hard questions go back to why the other studies are fundamentally flawed. Why were those questions not asked? Again, they left out the underestimated transition costs, they have used a so-called typical household, and the fact that they look at exceptionally high projections for market returns. Those are the questions we need to send back to our children.

I would also say, I am not giving up on our children, our sons and our daughters. They see the benefit to their parents or, in some cases, their grandparents. They understand that their parents are being able to pay for their education. They are able to help them buy that first home, because their parents' parents are not reliant on them for their everyday household needs. I think that that is very important.

So if we just let them kind of capture back in, look around and see the benefits social security has provided in their own family, in their own family today, and then look at friends who might have had a loss of a parent, or if they have had somebody who has been on disability at an early age, they can truly look and see what this program has provided. I hope we will continue to do these kinds of things, to continue to bring these issues to the American people.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) has been great, and I have enjoyed this, I say to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank both Members for their continuing work on this topic.

I would just summarize in these closing minutes and say that the first thing is to put social security first. We say, save social security first. Do not engage in a bunch of new spending programs. Do not dissipate the surplus with some politically-motivated changes in the tax code. Use the resources that are available at this great time in the American economy to see that social security is saved first.

Then second, it is a matter of our working towards a bipartisan agreement. I believe that we can do that in a constructive way. We must do that. We should move forward immediately with the President's program and see how we can make it even better to preserve this very valuable system.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK EARLE McCAMMOND, AN EAGLE SCOUT FROM CARTERET COUNTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is not an easy time for young children in America. Mixed messages from our society about morality and the value of truth can confuse an already difficult time for our Nation's children.

When so many young people today are finding destructive means to cope

with everyday frustrations and concerns, I am proud to bring to Members' attention an outstanding young man from the Third District of North Carolina who has taken positive steps to ensure a bright future for himself and his community.

At just 14 years of age, Patrick Earle McCammond recently achieved the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. The Eagle Scout rank is the highest rank in scouting. In fact, only about 2.5 percent of Boy Scouts ever achieve Eagle Scout. It is an accomplishment reserved for young men who incorporate the principles in the Boy Scout oath and the Boy Scout motto in their daily lives, and earn 21 merit badges in areas ranging from community service and leadership to physical fitness. Patrick not only handled and met these standards, but he far surpassed the minimum requirements. In all, Patrick has earned a total of 55 merit badges, with more in the works. That is more than double what is required.

He has also received a number of honors and awards within Boy Scouts in his community, which include the Arrow of Light, World Conservation Award, International Catholic Awareness Medallion, and the High Adventure Patch.

While achieving this rank itself is an accomplishment, Patrick has literally dedicated his youth to helping his community. When I learned of Patrick's achievements at such a young age, I certainly was impressed. But only when I learned about a project he developed for his community did I fully recognize the impact of scouting on Patrick's life and his future.

One additional requirement for Eagle Scout is the completion of a service project to benefit a religious institution, school, or community. We have a strong military presence in North Carolina. In the Third District alone, which I have the privilege to represent, we have four military bases with 77,000 retired veterans and another 10,000 retired military. Knowing this, Patrick created a website designed to assist the veterans in his Carteret County community.

Mr. Speaker, there are many young men in the Third District of North Carolina like Patrick who have achieved the rank of Eagle Scout, and even more who will in the future. As their congressman, I am proud of each and every one.

What makes Patrick McCammond's efforts special to me is his concern for our veterans. No matter what age, we as a Nation must never forget the men and women who have served this Nation to protect the freedoms we enjoy today.

Patrick paid tribute by taking steps to research, create, and implement his project. First he worked with computer professionals and area veterans' organizations to develop the website, which he named carteretvets.org. He obtained technical and financial support from

local businesses in order to print informative guides he designed to publicize the website. He worked with his fellow scouts and classmates to check the site to ensure it was complete, and to check for flaws.

□ 1700

Finally, he led demonstrations to introduce his complete project to local veterans groups. Hundreds of veterans across the country have now visited and benefited from Patrick's web site.

Outside of his life as a member of the Boy Scouts, Patrick serves as the eighth grade class representative to his school student council at Annunciation Catholic School. He maintains a B average in his studies and is a state-level swimmer on the Carteret Currents swim team.

Patrick also serves as one of the 32 students who were selected from hundreds in the entire State of North Carolina to be a First Flight Ambassador for the Class of 2003, First Flight Centennial.

Mr. Speaker, in today's society it is easy to lose sight of the values of honor, integrity, and character, yet they are the foundations that make our citizens and our Nation strong.

I would like to thank the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Little League, and all programs and organizations within our communities that work to help teach our children values and help them to recognize their own potential.

Mr. Speaker, Patrick McCammond exemplifies all that is good in the youth of America today. I am proud of him and the example that he is setting for his peers by taking pride in his family, his faith, and his country. In his actions and in his deeds he, and all who participate in Scouting, reflect the values and spirit of community service that will build the future leaders who will make us all proud.

OBVIOUS BENEFITS OF A CONSERVATIVE, HUMANITARIAN APPROACH TO GOVERNING IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, before I start, let me just invite all of our colleagues who are watching and following the floor proceedings on the Republican side who have been looking forward to this evening's special order as an opportunity to showcase and feature a number of the successes of the Republican Conference here in Congress.

Our agenda is one, of course, of fighting for lower taxes, fighting for strong national defense, insisting that we find methods to secure and safeguard the Social Security Administration, and creating and providing the world's best education structure. I want to talk about the obvious benefits of a conservative, humanitarian approach to governing in America.

I want to do that, Mr. Speaker, by highlighting a couple of articles that appeared in the Denver Post over the last few days. Here is the headline: "Welfare rolls drop 42 percent. State's decline is faster than the U.S. average."

This is important to note because Colorado, among the 50 States, is considered a low-tax State. Colorado is a State where the regulatory burden on Colorado businesses and those who create job opportunities is relatively low. It is a State where we have been serious, quite serious about putting the welfare reform proposals passed by this Congress into place at the State level, and the result is very dramatic and very positive for the people of Colorado. Again, a 42 percent drop in the welfare caseloads over the last 18 months.

It is a real credit and a dramatic bit of evidence as to what can be achieved through lower taxation at the Federal level, lower regulation burdens on those who are creating jobs, and a healthy economy and business climate.

Mr. Speaker, here is a quote from one individual. He said that this is primarily due to employment opportunities and to a "work-first" model of welfare reform. This is a quote by Maynard Chapman, Welfare Reform Program Manager for the Colorado Department of Human Services.

"But if job opportunities are not out there, I don't care what type of welfare reform design you're using, it is not going to work because the job opportunities are not out there."

It highlights, that comment, what the Republican Party has been suggesting and promoting for a long time. That by focusing on a stronger, more vibrant economy we can structure welfare reform in a way that works, as it has for a woman named Teri Higgins who was quoted in the article.

Reform for her has meant a new way of life. After being on welfare for 3½ years, she is almost completely self-sufficient. She was a full-time student halfway through her associates degree program in business administration when welfare reform kicked in 2 years ago. Under the new system she had to work, so she decided to work in a work-study program at Community College of Denver. Within a year, the 37-year-old single mother of three boys went from being a welfare recipient to the office manager for the Division of Business and Government Studies at CCD.

Mr. Speaker, here is what she says. "What made the difference were the extra things," such as helping her provide for day care so she could go to school, the emotional support from counselors. She said that she still struggles. She makes a decent wage and it is hard to make ends meet, "but when I sit down and write checks out for all my bills and everything is paid, that is really a good feeling."

I suggest that for Teri Higgins, and for millions of people just like her, this pathway to self-sufficiency is the defi-

nition of liberty and freedom in America. It is made possible by the Republican majority in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate that, for the last 4 years that we have had the majority, heading into our fifth year, we have focused on tax relief. We have focused on families. We have focused on reducing the regulatory burden on those who provide the kind of jobs that Teri now enjoys. That, in the end, is by far a better definition of a caring, compassionate, humanitarian, conservative philosophy designed to put people first and help Americans help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me. I am especially interested in some of the definitions that tend to waft around inside the Beltway here, one being "compassion." I think, if one saw the New York Times last week, they saw an example of this. The noted commentator and columnist, Tony Snow, mentioned it this past Sunday on Fox News Sunday when a front page article in the New York Times bemoaned the reduction in applications for food stamps.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply affirm that the truest form of compassion is not adding people to the welfare rolls, not adding people to the food stamps program. The true definition of compassion is helping those people, just as the gentleman from Colorado mentioned, move from welfare to work so that they have the opportunity to provide for themselves and their families, so that they have the chance to realize their hopes and their dreams. That is the true measure of compassion.

Mr. Speaker, I must also note with great interest some of the comments in the preceding hour. It is sad to hear some come to this floor and so passionately try to sell an agenda of fear to the American public, rather than facts, to merchant or to market the politics of fear as opposed to the policies of hope.

Mr. Speaker, this common-sense conservative majority, in the tradition of welfare reform, is moving four major goals:

Number one, to protect, save and improve Social Security and Medicare.

Number two, to offer meaningful tax relief for working Americans.

Number three, to improve education, not by micromanagement from Washington bureaucrats but by empowering parents and students and teachers and local school districts.

And, number four, to strengthen our national defense and security.

Indeed, I was walking over with a constituent, a man who lives in Winslow, Arizona, part of the Guard and Reserves and also a Federal employee. He was telling me on the way over to this Chamber how he and his wife embrace the notion of lower taxes for everyone because they do not want to see some-

one punished for succeeding. They understand that as they will experience this year, with a child under 17 still at home, a \$400 per child tax credit. That \$400 stays in their pocket to save, spend, or invest as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, that is the challenge, is it not? Is there not a central choice here? Who do we trust, Washington bureaucrats or our family, to make decisions? That is the key and that is what we champion in this common-sense majority.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see another of our colleagues, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI), one of our newcomers. I welcome him to the Chamber. We are glad that he is here.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, my friend and colleague, for yielding to me. I certainly concur with the remarks that have been made to date with regard to the issue of taxation, the impact it has on the country, the effect it has on productivity, the ability for this Nation to move ahead, to create jobs, to create wealth.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that whatever we tax, we get less of; whatever we subsidize, we get more of. The fact is that when we tax productivity, when we tax jobs, we are going to get less of them. It is not, as they say, "rocket science" to realize that this is the effect of overtaxation.

We are now at a rate of taxation in this country that has never before been seen. Many people do not realize that because times are good. We hear it all the time: Times are good. And so there is an assumption that if everybody is employed, that everybody enjoys paying a high level of taxes just because they have a job.

But, Mr. Speaker, they do not. As a matter of fact, even those people who are employed and making good wages deserve a tax break, deserve a tax reduction. Even those people who are on farms and who have spent a lifetime investing in the land and bring food to our tables, those people need a tax break. Those people need to have the abolishment of the inheritance tax. This is something that this Republican Congress is going to put forward. It is one of the many issues that we will drive forward to attempt once again to bring into line this Federal Government that is, in fact, oppressive enough to actually raise almost 20 percent of the GDP now going to taxes. Most families in this country are paying upwards of 40 percent of their income in taxes.

I cannot believe that there are people even here in this body, but certainly on that side of the aisle, who would suggest that that is anything even remotely near fair. There is nothing fair about taking 40 cents out of every single dollar that a man or woman working in this Nation makes and giving it to the government. There is nothing fair out of that. We do not get that much out of it.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, when we listen to our constituents, as the

gentleman from Arizona mentioned a little earlier, our constituents will tell us and help us to understand how important this issue is. I want to share with my colleagues a letter I received from a woman in Fort Morgan, Colorado. She said, "Since Republicans gained control of the House and Senate in 1994, my husband and I have been eagerly looking forward to some kind of tax reduction." And she said this January she is going to be retiring early. Her biggest concern, number one urgent need, is further tax relief to allow her and her husband to do some better financial planning and to deal with the situation that is about to change in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I brought a stack of letters from constituents back home and over and over and over again these constituents tell us that the upwards of 40 percent of taxes, when we consider the Federal, State and local taxes and when we consider the cost of regulation on top of that, the cost of being an American citizen is well over 50 percent of income. By no one's definition can that be regarded as being fair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) who has joined us.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think we get some of the same letters. I have a letter from a woman in Savannah, Georgia. "Dear Mr. Kingston, I recently heard you say how much taxes have increased since the 1950s. Can you give me those statistics again? I am a homemaker in Savannah, Georgia, with four children and would greatly appreciate the ability of our family to keep more of its hard-earned money. Signed, Elizabeth Morris."

The income tax burden in the 1950s, as the gentleman from Arizona knows well, being on the Committee on Ways and Means, was 5 percent. In the 1970s when we were growing up, most of us in this room, it was 16 percent. Today it is 24 percent.

That is just the income tax. That is not talking about the property taxes and all the other incurred taxes that our constituents and hard-working middle-class people have to pay. But the reality is the higher our tax burden, the less time we have to spend with our family, with our children imparting values, teaching them the work ethic, teaching them right from wrong, because that second income in the family often is going to pay for Uncle Sam and our excesses.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a point that needs to be brought home is something borrowing from the gentleman from Colorado who talked about the percentage of our gross domestic product that now goes to taxation. Though I fear, Mr. Speaker, from time to time that is a very salient point and factually correct, sometimes we need to translate that into everyday language by offering other examples, and the gentleman from Georgia has done so.

I would say it this way, borrowing from my other colleague from Colo-

rado: There has come to be in this Nation an observance of a day that is not exactly a holiday, though it offers emancipation from the burden of taxation.

□ 1715

We call it tax freedom day. Depending on the calculation, whether we are talking exclusively about Federal taxes or if we combine them all, as the gentleman from Colorado pointed out, the cost of all taxation and the hidden costs of regulation, quite often, American citizens work from January 1 through our Independence Day or close to it on an annual basis to free themselves from the yoke of taxation. That is what we are talking about here.

These deal with flesh and blood human beings who are facing decisions, who, oft times, in a household, we will see both parents working, not by choice but by necessity, as my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, points out, because one spouse is working essentially to continue to pay and satisfy the gaping wall of taxation.

It is a very simple concept here. One works hard for the money one earns. One should hang onto more of it and send less of it here to Washington, D.C., because now we find ourselves in the day of an overcharge. We are overcharging for government services.

When money hangs around the Federal Treasury, it is kind of like cookies in the jar in the Hayworth household. Somehow somebody gets to it. In the case of the money, it is spent by bureaucrats. As the attorneys would say, there is a preponderance of physical evidence to say what happens to the cookies in the cookie jar and who might get them from time to time.

So what we again must embrace is this notion of broad-based tax reform. Despite the calls of those who would offer the politic of fear, we embrace the policies of hope when we say that every American who succeeds ought to have the opportunity to hang on to more of what he or she earns and send less of it to the Federal Government; and understand that those who have succeeded through their investment, through their risk taking, if you will, in the marketplace, create jobs and create more opportunity and help to fuel an economic boom.

So that is what we champion here, along with our three other pillars of policy in the 106th Congress, to strengthen and protect Medicare, to improve education by empowering parents and local communities and, thirdly, to improve and bolster our national defense.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, our new colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), has been sworn in for a little less than 2 months; and I am curious, what has his constituents been telling him? Has he been hearing about the issue of taxes in the short time that he has been a Member of Congress?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have certainly been hearing a great deal. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that I can put it more succinctly or more profoundly than a constituent from Aurora who writes, "The American dream has always been to get married and raise a family, to own your own business, to own your own farm, to build a secure and better future for your children to enjoy, to pass on what you have worked so hard for and paid taxes along the way for the next generation."

"For the past 20 years, I have successfully built several dealerships, providing jobs and revenue to several communities. These past years, I have given my all to build and make a secure future for my heirs. This can all be taken away from them if I should die and they should have to pay 55 percent on the estate. Would they have to liquidate or sell to be able to pay the estate tax? What would happen to everything that I worked so hard to provide for them? I support the estate tax reform so that not just me but all who have worked hard and built a nest egg for the future generation can keep it, not the government."

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, again, a profound communication from a constituent who understands fully the implications of this. I recognize that, for years, the idea behind an estate tax or let us call it what it is, it is a death tax, the idea behind that, it is a class envy thing, to a certain extent, where people felt, well, if people amass too much, we should actually just take it away from them and divvy it up again; that is only fair. Well, it is not fair. Again, this idea of fairness, to whom is it fair? It is not fair to this gentleman. It is not fair to his family.

Another thing, if one cannot accumulate for oneself and for one's heirs, for whom will one accumulate? The government? Would we be expecting the people in this country to go out and work day in and day out, again, creating real value, something the government knows very well about the actual creation of value? Do we expect John and Jane Q. Citizen to go out every single day to do that, only to give it away upon their death so they cannot pass it on to their heirs? No, of course not.

This is as socialistic a tax as we have in this country, and it should be done away with; as well as all tax reform efforts I think on the part of this Congress should move forward dramatically.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time for one question. The common misconception by the liberals on the House floor when we debate reductions in the death tax or the inheritance tax is that this is a tax that one only needs to be concerned about if one is extraordinarily wealthy. But the inheritance tax applies to anyone who has parents and who is part of a will or a trust or estate. It is virtually every American.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) agree with me that this is a tax that every single American ought to be concerned about?

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a tax that every American should be concerned about. Not only that, the idea that the only people who pay it are the wealthy, I mean, go and look at the farmers of America today. Find me, this wealthy farmer out there who has wealth, as I say, yes, he has got wealth in the land, but it is just in the land. In order to transfer that wealth into true, hard, honest dollars, he has to dispose of it or his heirs do in order to pay this tax.

So it is bogus to suggest it is Daddy Warbucks, as the liberals and the Democrats want to suggest. That is the kind of picture they want to conjure up when we talk about eliminating the inheritance tax or the death tax. Well, it is not. It is the family farmers in Kansas and Colorado and Oklahoma and throughout this land that work every single day to put food on our tables. So my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), is absolutely right in that respect.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, just to bring home the point again, mindful of the letters the gentleman brought from constituents, and as pleased as I am, Mr. Speaker, that one of my constituents from Winslow, Arizona, joined me on the stroll over, this topic of death taxes came up at a town hall meeting last year in Winslow, Arizona. As our schedule worked out, this was a noon-time meeting.

One of the great satisfactions of this incredible honor of serving in the Congress of the United States is we meet so many people who want to make a difference. Two young men had gotten an excuse from school on their lunch hour, an early dismissal, to come to the town hall. These two young men had aspirations of attending one of our military academies.

They came, and they heard some of the seniors and other citizens in the room discussing just what my colleagues have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, this incredible unfairness of the death tax. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it was reminiscent of the franchise that Art Linkletter used with such great effect over the years, "Kids say the darnedest things."

Here was this young man standing there just at the height of his youth and enthusiasm and wanting to do the right thing and wanting to join the military. He stood there ramrod straight and said, "Congressman, sir, do you mean to tell me the Federal Government taxes you when you die?" And there was laughter, just as this response comes. But as I reminded the citizens assembled, it really was not funny.

My colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), was quoted in the Wall Street Journal during his

first term who evoked memories of our early colonial days when he said of the death tax, "No taxation without representation." That particular observation has stuck with me.

But, Mr. Speaker, it goes further than that. Understand that this tax is so oppressive and our mission as a constitutional republic has gone so far afield. Remember what Benjamin Franklin wrote in Poor Richard's Almanac, "There are only two certainties in this life: death and taxes."

But even Dr. Franklin with his tax and his ability to invent and to almost see into time and foretell the future, even Dr. Franklin would be shocked to come back to this constitutional republic that he helped to found, and his reaction would be much like the reaction of the young man. Do you mean to tell me this government taxes you when you die?

We have seen it in our districts, in our States, across the country. Energetic enterprises, businesses that are not huge conglomerates but family-owned businesses, whether on Main Street or on the ranch or on the farm, those businesses broken apart, the assets sold, to satisfy or try to satisfy this most egregious tax that reaches in even to the grave to rob those who have accomplished.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned young people, mentioned those who are trying to establish businesses. My colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI), mentioned farmers and ranchers, that literally every American is affected by the inheritance taxes.

I want to share with my colleagues another letter that I received just a few weeks ago. This was sent as a Mailogram, as it was addressed to me. It says, "The administration's 2000 budget plan presented to Congress on February 1 imposes new taxes that will make it harder for millions of American families to save for their own retirement needs and will seriously jeopardize the financial protection of families and businesses."

The writer goes on, and this is a writer from Loveland, Colorado in my district, "Providing for retirement and securing your family's financial security should not be a, quote, taxing experience. Americans are taking more responsibility for their own financial futures, and they have made it clear that they oppose both direct and indirect tax bites that jeopardize their retirement security and their ability to protect their families. Congress on a bipartisan basis soundly rejected a similar approach last year."

I will interject, it is true that the President, under the administration's budget, proposed a litany of new taxes on the American people, which the Republican Congress was fortunately here to prevent.

He goes on, "And I strongly urge you to do the same this time around. Please oppose any new direct or indirect taxes."

At a time when the Federal Government confiscates upwards of 40 percent of an average family's income, it is almost incomprehensible that, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, they are conjuring up new plans for the 2000 budget to raise approximately 73 new taxes, new taxes on businesses, on farmers, ranchers, on financial institutions.

In the end, what it does is it takes away the liberty and freedom and the success that is being discovered throughout the country in States like Colorado where we are seeing again headlines like this, "Welfare Rolls Drop 42 Percent."

The reason those welfare rolls are dropping is because Colorado in this case is a State with relatively low State taxes with a very high regard for a favorable and growing business climate. These high taxes rob the American people of opportunity. They rob average families from the ability, from the assets necessary to do the simple things in life, like raise a family and keep a roof over your head and put food on the table.

It makes it virtually impossible for the entrepreneurs to fully captivate and capture the great American spirit of self-sufficiency, not only to provide for themselves through an economic enterprise, but to provide jobs for others who need them, jobs like those that I mentioned that used to be welfare recipients who are now self-sufficient. That is really what is at stake.

The tax debate in Congress is not about simply cutting taxes or trying to win elections on the basis of tax reform. The tax relief debate is about real people, about real Americans, real farmers and ranchers who are struggling today, real business owners who are trying to provide more jobs and allow for more people to escape welfare. It is about the children of these families who deserve the same kind of America that we all enjoy and rally around.

That is what this tax debate is about. It is a very personal, humanitarian debate. It is one that we need to win. We do need to stand in the way of those people over in the executive branch of government who think this is the perfect year to raise more taxes, new taxes on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI).

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, it is so true that the perception that is held by so many people, even here in this town, certainly on the other side of the aisle and over at the White House, is that the country will actually not only survive another tax increase but we can get away with it because, again, as I say, times are good. Somehow this blanks out everything else.

We assume that we can then start promising everything to everybody again. We can come up with how many hundred programs were mentioned, how many hundreds of billions of dollars of expenditures were suggested by

the President in his budget? All of this, with keeping a straight face and suggesting that we are not going to, quote, bust the budget; we are going to maintain an agreement.

Of course, the only way that he could possibly make that statement, Mr. Speaker, the only way is because he was able to play a shell game with the Social Security issue. He was able to suggest that we could take, as he says, 62 percent, the President of the United States in his State of the Union message, and since then has suggested that we could take 62 percent of the "Social Security surplus," apply it toward Social Security and, somehow or other, that would solve our problem; and that would allow for, of course, us to do other things. It would create other programs.

Well, we know why, my friends, is because if we are talking about not correcting and not reforming the Social Security system, if we are talking about not actually building a firewall between the Social Security fund and the rest of the government expenditures, then we can do it.

□ 1730

Because what he is really suggesting is an increase over whatever 62 percent represents of this "surplus", however much money that is. That is what he is suggesting he is going to do to increase the Social Security debt. Because it is truly debt. It is not money.

When our friends and neighbors pay money to the government, when they send in their FICA taxes, they think they are actually putting money in a bank. That is the thought, because it is a fund. It is called the Social Security fund. Well, that is not it at all. There is nothing in the fund. There are no dollars in the fund. There are \$750 billion worth of papers stamped nonnegotiable bonds. That is the only place an instrument like that is in use in this whole Nation. Nonnegotiable bonds.

Well, what the President is suggesting is that he is going to correct this by adding 62 percent of the surplus to that debt, to those nonnegotiable bonds, and take the actual revenues, bringing it into the general fund again and creating more new programs. It is a shell game. But he is masterful at it, there are no two ways about it.

So I suggest to my colleagues that we should clear up this issue and we should bring to the attention of the American public the facts regarding Social Security and tax reduction. We should, in fact, create that fire wall between the Social Security fund and the general fund, and we should still move, I think quickly and dramatically, toward tax reduction and reform.

Mr. HAYWORTH. My colleague makes a very, very good point. It has been echoed by several economists and several columnists. Indeed, Robert J. Samuelson in this town talks about the double counting.

We have dealt so much for so long on so many topics, sadly, in an atmos-

phere of doublespeak from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Indeed, my colleague from Colorado, perhaps unintentionally, was describing quite accurately the feeling of many Americans when he used the phrase "get away with it", an abdication of responsibility so breathtaking and shocking not only in terms of personal conduct but also in terms, Mr. Speaker, of the sacred trust which we assume as constitutional officers.

Mr. Speaker, it is a wonder to see some who come to this chamber, as did our President for his State of the Union message, and stand at the podium behind me here. I took my own copious notes, and by my count the President proposed 80 new programs, 80 new programs, in the span of 77 minutes. And now, when our friends put a sharp pencil to paper and check the very real cost of those programs, to really pay for those programs we must have close to 80 new taxes or fee increases. And yet those who would tell us that they would guard the surplus, that they somehow are true guardians of the public trust, are engaged, in fact, in double count and doublespeak.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we heard it in this very chamber in the hour preceding this one, when those who look for shortcuts to political advantage continue to market and play upon the politics of fear rather than the policies of truth and hope. That is what we hear, Mr. Speaker, even in the wake of today's passage of a bipartisan resolution recommitting this Congress to the safety and sanctity of Social Security. We had one gentleman from Texas come to this floor and, in essence, say that Social Security was going to be destroyed. How sad and how false.

We have a responsibility to our constituents who have called upon us to represent them, to govern, because we have been selected by the people and for the people. And, oh, how I yearn for straight talk and taking a look and making the tough decisions. Because as I said in this chamber earlier today, Mr. Speaker, we cannot approach this as Republicans or as Democrats but as Americans to solve this problem. And yet the temptation of political advantage and the siren song of notoriety inside the beltway tends to propel others in these very partisan directions.

Let us at long last, Mr. Speaker, call for truth in personal conduct and in leveling with the American people both on matters of demeanor and policies of government. Is that too much to ask?

Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear the Vice President of the United States say to the assembled press corps 1 year ago, "My legal counsel informs me there is no controlling legal authority." I think the Vice President was wrong. There is a controlling legal authority. It is called the Constitution of the United States.

And, moreover, there is a compelling and controlling moral authority, and it is called the oath of office that each of us take. And how those succumb to

temptations to "get away with it", whatever "it" may be, is both galling and not to be easily understood; and, in the final analysis, reprehensible, because it ignores and it counterfeits the sacred trust that citizens have placed in us.

That is the challenge we face; not to be facile and glib and get away with it, but to be about the business of the people; not to fly from place to place for campaign-like rallies, but to join with us and govern; and not to double count or double deal or doublespeak, but to work out legitimate differences and speak as best we can with one voice to confront these problems. These are the challenges we face.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, these unfortunate strategies that the gentleman has described that we typically see coming out of the White House are really emblematic of, I think, what the White House realizes the American people want to see, what they want to hear, and what they intuitively know and believe, and that is the belief that a large Federal Government is inherently bad for the American society. So they do go through all of these machinations and smoke and mirror strategies to try to mask and conceal what it is they really are pushing for and pushing toward.

The bottom line is their vision for America is a larger Federal Government that defines a society. Our vision as a Republican majority is for a smaller Federal Government and a greater American people. And I say a greater American people in the context of what the budget debate in this Congress is generally all about.

Thomas Jefferson said that there will always be two prevailing parties in a political system, the side that believes that we organize ourselves around a central government structure and there is the other side that believes that we organize ourselves around the strength of individuals. Those two parties are alive and well today.

The Democrat party that the gentleman described is one that is using remarkable linguistic gymnastics to double count imaginary money to suggest we should feel safe and secure that the government is not growing, when, in fact, it is growing by leaps and bounds. The national debt continues to grow on a year-by-year basis.

Our mission as a Republican Party is precisely the opposite. We want to invest the public's wealth in appropriate ways. We believe, however, that that wealth is better invested with the people who earn it. We want to shrink the amount of cash that makes its way to Washington, D.C., thereby strengthening the amount of cash that stays in the pockets of the American families, the American farmers, the American business men and women who work hard every day, who are the true individuals who define what it means to be an American.

In the end, we care about saving and rescuing the Social Security System

and rescuing the Medicare trust fund. We care about a strong national defense and having world class schools second to none. In order to do that, we can raise the resources necessary to accomplish these goals by focusing on economic growth, not a growth in the tax rate. And that is a key distinction and a key difference.

I notice the gentleman from Georgia is here, and I will yield the floor to him.

Mr. KINGSTON. I have a letter that somewhat ties into this, and I wanted to bring it up. It is from Mr. Jones Taylor of Saint Simons Island, Georgia, and he just says, paraphrasing here, that "I was disappointed in the Republican lack of agenda during 1998. Are you guys going to do that again or what is your agenda?"

I can say very easily what my agenda is, and I regret that I have not been here the whole time, so my colleagues may have discussed it, but I call it the BEST military, health care and agriculture: "B" for balancing the budget and paying down the debt; "E" for excellence in education; "S" for saving Social Security; "T" for lowering taxes. A strong military, a health care system that is affordable and accessible and a safe and abundant food supply.

Now, in that context, the gentleman mentioned stimulating the economy. One of the great ways to do that, of course, is to pay down the debt. We pay down the debt and then the big bear, the big monster in the interest market, in the borrowing market, the Federal Government, takes a smaller percentage of the interest out there. And that is a great way to stimulate the economy.

And if we do have a strong economy, revenues to the Federal Government go up and we will have a lot of money for expanding and strengthening our military, to increase the pay for our hard working soldiers, and, of course, to give the teachers in the classroom the educational funds that they need, and to shore up Social Security and Medicare. BEST military, health care and agriculture. That is a very solid agenda.

I know in each area of the country there are different things that we can emphasize. Agriculture in Colorado will be a little different than agriculture in Georgia, but the fundamentals of having a safe and abundant food supply is just as important in Colorado or Arizona as it is in Georgia.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Does the gentleman from Colorado have anything else to add?

Mr. TANCREDO. Well, I would just say that I have learned a lot of things in this last month and a half from my experience here in the Congress, and I must tell my colleagues that one of the scariest realizations that I have come to is that there is the possibility that there are, I do not know, certainly a large number, maybe a majority of the people even in this body who believe

that, in fact, the government is not big enough; that, in fact, we have not paid enough taxes and that we need to pay more.

I keep thinking to myself that either I am certainly out of touch or the rest of these people are. My colleague from Colorado knows, because we have spoken to some of the same groups, I can go home and there is a group called the Jefferson County Men's Club and there is the Arapaho County Men's Club, and I always think to myself when I hear people say things like this, that taxes are not high enough, that government is not big enough, I think how would this play in front of the Jefferson County Men's Club or the Arapaho County Men's Club? What would they say if I came back to them and said there are a lot of people there who think government is not big enough and ask them what they think. I can tell my colleagues I know what they would say; that we are out of our minds. And sometimes it sounds like it.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Let me once again, Mr. Speaker, bring this issue to the perspective of those who are not business owners, who are not those who enjoy extravagant wealth, but every day Americans who are struggling hard to make ends meet.

Once again I use the State of Colorado as an example: A low-tax State. A small government State. Here is another news article from my State that is just a couple days old. It says, "The boom boosts fringe: Transients among many landing jobs. Colorado's booming job market has given a boost to those who historically have lived on the outskirts of the economy, from the homeless veterans to the working poor. Clients of the Salvation Army, the Harbor Program", which is in downtown Denver, "are landing jobs above minimum wage." That is according to the resident manager Mark Garramone. Here is a quote from him. He says, "As a matter of fact, they are finding a lot of good jobs." He says, "Among those jobs cited were car salesmen, chauffeur, a few work at U.S. West." At the Department of Veterans Affairs, listen to this, here is a quote, "We placed in jobs the highest number of veterans in 1998 that we have ever placed." That according to Greg Bittle, Chief of the VA's Regional Office for Vocational Rehabilitation and Counseling. He says, "In fact, the booming economy tends to pull people away. We are basically a training and education program, and the economy has been so robust that we will have vets drop out of school to take jobs." It just goes on and on.

□ 1745

Here is another example that was mentioned in here. Laurie Harvey, Executive Director of the Center for Women's Employment and Education, I went and visited this facility in Denver 2 years ago. It places low-income women, largely from the welfare rolls, in jobs. They say that so many of Colo-

rado's welfare recipients have moved off the rolls and into employment that her nonprofit is now seeing more and more people who are harder to serve.

So when it comes to public assistance for those who are looking for employment, we are narrowing our focus to those who have the legitimate needs for some kind of assistance, whether it is some kind of disability or handicap or whatever the case is.

It even goes beyond that. Listen to this last quote I will mention. It says, I would say there is probably a shortage of entry level labor. This is from Timothy Hall, chief executive officer for Larinden, which trains and places developmentally challenged people. He says, it is easier to convince employers to hire people with disabilities.

Low taxes, low regulation, small government in a State like Colorado is the model that we ought to look toward here at the Federal Government. The model of Colorado is putting people back to work who are veterans, those who suffer from disabilities, those who have been on welfare for years and years and years, those who are clients of the Salvation Army. Charity after charity after charity is celebrating the positive benefits of a strong, vibrant economy accomplished through smaller government, lower taxation, less regulation and more attention to growing a prosperous economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just follow the observation and say it is my honor to serve on the House Committee on Ways and Means; and our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), currently chairs the Subcommittee on Social Security but in the 104th Congress it was his job as chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources to put in place welfare reform.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I cannot help but remember that essentially the same welfare reform package intact was passed once by this Congress and vetoed by the President; again by this Congress and vetoed by the President; and finally, when it was sent the third time, as we understand from press accounts, one of the President's political consultants used the baseball analogy, saying, Mr. President, you do not want three strikes and you are out; sign this legislation.

I appreciate the fact and indeed, Mr. Speaker, we all know from our civics class, that we enact laws, but the President must execute his signature to see those laws implemented. So we welcomed at long last his signature. This is an example of a contentious challenge that was met head-on even in the atmosphere of contention in that 104th Congress to bring about a desired change, to now where we can measure compassion by a more accurate barometer by the number of people who voluntarily leave the welfare rolls in favor

of work; by the news that there are fewer applicants for food stamps because people are becoming self-sufficient.

Again understand, we make no pretense of ripping away the social safety net, but welfare reform helps prevent that safety net from turning into a hammock. That is what we have accomplished on both sides of the aisle. And that spirit, that example, should serve us well as we deal with this very difficult question of Social Security reform. How do we best save it? How do we maximize opportunities for all of our citizens, regardless of their age or their station in life?

Mr. SCHAFFER. In our remaining few minutes, I want to really talk about the importance of communicating with Members of Congress. The four of us who are here tonight I think are very representative of the Republican majority Members who serve in the House of Representatives. We rely heavily on the letters and phone calls from constituents, those who show up at the town meetings and find ways to communicate with their Members of Congress directly.

Those kinds of letters, phone calls and communications from constituents really arm us, as Members, with the real-life examples that are necessary to take on the party of the large bureaucracy, take on the White House and those who believe that, in a year like this, that higher taxes, for example, is a good idea. It is letters from constituents that tell us and remind us every day that bigger government is a thing of the past.

Let me use one more example from my district. This is under the letterhead of Tri-City Sprinkler and Landscape. It is from Loveland, Colorado. It says, Dear Representative Schaffer, I am your constituent from Loveland. As a business owner and grandparent, I am very concerned about the serious economic problems facing our country. I feel our current income tax structure is having a very negative impact by taxing production, savings and investment, the very things which can make our economy strong. Therefore, I support replacing the income tax and the IRS with a national consumption tax such as suggested in H.R. 2001, the National Retail Sales Tax Act. I urge you and your staff to look into it and co-sponsor it. Please let me know where you stand on this important matter.

I will write back to the constituent and give her my opinions and thoughts on that. I mention this letter and others that we have gone through tonight just to let the American people know that this government does not belong to the President. This government does not belong to any single Member of Congress. It does not belong to the Supreme Court. It belongs to the people just like the woman who wrote this letter, just like the people who write all of these other letters, and we really do rely on their advice and their assistance and their help in helping make

the case on behalf of individual Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) the remaining few minutes that we have left.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN. I would like to mention when the gentleman talks about the issue of tax reform and going to a simpler and fairer tax system, Newsweek Magazine a few months ago on its cover had a story, a cover story about the IRS; and it said, The IRS: Lawless, Abusive, Out of Control.

When any major department or agency of the Federal Government can be described by a mainstream magazine like Newsweek as lawless, abusive and out of control, things have gotten to a pretty sad state. It is especially sad when an agency as intrusive as the Internal Revenue Service can be accurately described in that way. So I think we basically should just take the Internal Revenue Code that we have now and junk it and start over again. I think about 85 or 90 percent of the American people feel that way.

Mr. SCHAFFER. On the matter of constituent input, how helpful do you find that representing your district in Tennessee?

Mr. DUNCAN. I find it very helpful. For those who think that we have cut taxes too much, a few years ago we had a \$90 billion tax cut spread over 5 years because that was the most we could get through at that time. Some of the more liberal Members kicked and screamed about that, but that was spread over 5 years.

That was a tax cut of slightly less than 1 percent of Federal revenues over that 5-year period. Now the average person pays about 40 percent of his or her income in taxes and another 10 percent in government regulatory costs, at a minimum. So today you have one spouse working to support the government while the other spouse works to support the family.

I know the President said in Buffalo that he could not support a tax decrease because the American people would not spend it wisely. I can say I think they would spend it much more wisely than this wasteful, inefficient Federal Government that we have today.

Mr. KINGSTON. Following up on the comments of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), it is amazing that the President would say that the hard-working people who earn the money cannot spend it as well as some of the people here in Washington, maybe including the four of us. But I can say one thing. I believe people can spend their money better than we can spend their money.

The tax cut that you alluded to last year, it was an \$18 billion tax cut for one year; \$18 billion out of a \$1.7 trillion budget. It was just a slither of a slither in this huge \$1.7 trillion pot, and it was killed by the Senate.

Now, the Senate and the White House ganged up on the House to kill the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act, and I think that it is ridiculous to have that kind of obstruction to doing something that is common sense for the tax system. I hope this year that if we pass it that the other body will find their senses and quit siding with the liberal White House on everything and act like conservatives and pass tax reductions.

Mr. SCHAFFER. In the remaining minute, I would ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), is there anything he can do to dramatize the difference between the Democrats and the White House and what they stand for and the Republican majority in Congress and what we stand for?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is funny my colleague from Colorado should ask me that question. Because, just as our good friend from Tennessee pointed out in paraphrasing the words of our President, Mr. Speaker, these are the words of the President, if memory serves, one day, probably less than 12 hours, after he outlined 80 new programs involving close to 80 new taxes. Mr. Speaker, he said in Buffalo, New York, and I quote, speaking of the budget surplus, "We could give it all back to you and hope you spend it right but," closed quote. There, Mr. Speaker, therein lies a major difference. It comes down to a question of who do you trust? The President thinks you ought to trust him to spend your money for you.

We say, if there is ever a choice between Washington bureaucrats and the American people, Mr. Speaker, then we side with the American people, because, Mr. Speaker, Americans know best how to save, spend and invest for themselves and their families. Therein lies a difference, a difference of freedom and a real contrast between the politics of fear from those who make outrageous claims about Social Security and our budgetary process and the true policies of hope that we embrace with lower taxes, stronger schools, a stronger military and a real plan to save Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Republican colleagues who joined me here on the floor tonight to talk about our Republican vision for America. I want to thank the thousands of constituents who write to our offices individually virtually on a weekly basis. Their voice does matter. We are here tonight to assure them that the Republican majority is listening. It is important for the American people to express their thoughts and sentiments on whether the government should continue to grow as the President would propose or whether the government should be constrained in its growth as the Republican Party proposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The Chair reminds all Members